

position wherein said assemblies are free to move in either axial direction, each locking unit being urged towards its engaged position for automatic locking of said tripod in its deployed position with said cam locking being effected by pressure on said cam unit from its associated extended leg; and further comprising

d) a hand accessible release element for each leg assembly for independently releasing said at least one cam locking unit associated therewith, thereby enabling the shortening of the length of said assembly.

14. (amended) A tripod according to claim 1, wherein each compression-resistant member comprises at least one plastic, fiber-reinforced tube.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Applicants are amending original claims 1 and 14 to better describe the claimed invention. Applicants are amending original **Fig. 5** in order to include reference numeral 80. Applicants also are canceling original claim 3, without prejudice. Applicants are including a marked-up copy of amendments to the claims and drawings, with this responsive amendment. No new matter is added by the foregoing amendments and these amendments are fully supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the above-captioned patent application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

REMARKS

1. Objections and Rejections

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5), as allegedly failing to include a reference numeral 80 for the common center element. Claim 14 stands objected to as allegedly including typographical errors. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 12, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 765,175 to Gerts. Moreover, claims 2, 10, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly rendered obvious by Gerts in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,503,357 to Johnson *et al.* (“Johnson”). Further, claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly rendered obvious by Gerts in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,570,968 to Sassmannshausen *et al.* (“Sassmannshausen”). Moreover, claims 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly rendered obvious by Gerts in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,492,430 to Jones. Applicants respectfully traverse.